

09/820,433

MS158551.1

REMARKS

Claims 1-42 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 26, 37, 40, and 42 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-8 of this Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-17, 22, 25-33 and 37-42 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-17, 22, 25-33 and 37-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jordan (6,016,392). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons. Jordan does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

“A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) Emphasis added. “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the...claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1, 26, 37, 40 and 42 have been amended herein to recite in part that *interface wrappers* are employed to bridge communications between *managed and unmanaged* object systems. Managed and unmanaged object systems are distinguished in one aspect by the type of object lifetime management supported in such systems. In an unmanaged system, techniques such as reference counting are employed to manage object lifetime. For managed systems, techniques such as garbage collecting are employed. Interface wrappers support communications between these disparate type object systems in a unique and efficient manner.

In sharp contrast to the present invention, Jordan neither discloses nor suggests communications between managed and unmanaged object systems. Rather, Jordan merely discloses communications between objects in the same type of object system

09/820,433

MS158551.1

(e.g., COM system). For instance, Jordan does not contemplate how objects in a managed environment may communicate with objects in an unmanaged environment. Jordan merely teaches an alternative interface technique for an object - not bridging communications between objects operating in *disparate* object systems as claimed. Moreover, managed object systems are not disclosed or suggested in Jordan. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn for claims 1, 26, 37, 40, 42 and the claims which depend therefrom.

II. Rejection of Claims 18-21, 23, 24, 34-36 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 18-21, 23, 24, 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jordan in view of Foody *et al.* (5,732,270) (hereinafter Foody).

This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Foody does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Jordan with respect to amended claims 1, 26, 37, 40, 42. Notably, Foody does not teach or suggest the employment of *interface wrappers* as recited in these claims. Rather, Foody teaches creating a *redundant* proxy object that *mirrors* a foreign object. Thus, any manipulations to the proxy are mirrored in the foreign object. One clear disadvantage to creating a redundant object is this type of communication consumes more memory than the claimed invention that employs interface wrappers to communicate to a single object in a disparate system. Also, Foody does not disclose or suggest communications *between* managed and unmanaged object systems as recited in the claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection be withdrawn.

09/820,433

MS158551.1

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731